

III. REMARKS

The first Office Action on the merits in this application, dated November 2, 2007 (hereinafter “First Office Action”), and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed; this amendment is intended to be fully responsive to the First Office Action. Claims 1-7 are pending in the application; all pending claims presently stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 6 and 7, and added new claims 8-13. After entering this amendment, claims 1-13 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

A. AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification of the present application is objected to because paragraphs [0002] and [0008] of the specification, as indicated in Patent Publication No. 2007/0069546 A1, each “references specific claims which may change over the course of prosecution or be renumbered or deleted altogether.” First Office Action, at 2, Item No. 1. Responsively, appropriate corrections have been made to paragraphs [0002] and [0008] of the specification, as presented in the “Amendments to the Specification” section, hereinabove. Id., at 2. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

B. OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 2, 6 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: first, recitation of “element(s)” in claim 2 is deemed “inappropriate language for the claims since it is unclear what the applicant intends to recite”, First Office Action, at 2, Item No. 3; second, recitation of “the drive element” in claim 6 “should perhaps be ‘that at least one drive element’”, Id., Item No. 4; and, third, recitation of “‘connections (16)’ is incorrect since the reference numeral in the specification ... refer[s] to number ‘16’ as a pump”, Id., Item No. 5. Responsively, appropriate corrections have been made to claims 2, 6 and 7, as indicated in the “Listing of the Claims” section, *supra* at 3-4. In light of the amendments noted above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to claims 2, 6 and 7.

C. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. More specifically, the Examiner makes the following observations:

1. Claim 1 recites “‘its closed position’ in line 2, ‘the opened roof’ in lines 2-3, and ‘the auto body’ in lines 3-6”, and notes that “[t]here is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.” First Office Action, at 3, Item No. 9.
2. Claim 2 recites “‘the auto body’ in lines 2-3 and ‘the drive element(s)’ in line 3”, and notes that “[t]here is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.” Id., Item No. 10.
3. Claim 3 recites “‘the auto body’ in line 4”, and notes that “[t]here is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.” Id., Item No. 11.
4. Claim 7 recites “the limitation ‘it’ in line 4”, and notes that “[t]here is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.” Id., Item No. 12.

Responsive to the various 112, ¶2, rejections, Applicants have made appropriate corrections to the claims, as presented in the “Listing of the Claims” section, *supra* at 3-4, to provide proper antecedent basis throughout.

In light of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, rejection of claims 1-7.

D. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1-7 are deemed “allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph set forth in [the First] Office Action.” First Office Action, at 3, Item No. 13. As note above, *supra* § III.C., at 7, appropriate corrections have been made to the claims to provide proper antecedent basis throughout, thereby overcoming the pending 112, ¶2, rejection. As such, Applicants submit that claims 1-7 are now in condition for allowance, such action being herein respectfully requested.

E. NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new claims 8-13, as set forth in the “Listing of the Claims” section, *supra* at 4-5. No new matter is introduced into the subject application through the


proposed addition of claims 8-13, as the new claims are fully supported by originally presented claims 1-6, Figs. 1-5 of the drawings, and paragraphs [0020]-[0028] of the specification.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and corresponding remarks set forth above, this submission is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action dated November 2, 2007. The amendments and remarks in support of the rejected claims are believed to place this application in condition for allowance, which action is herein respectfully requested. In the event formal matters remain, the Examiner is respectfully encouraged to call the undersigned to discuss those matters before any further action is taken.

Respectfully submitted,

MARIAN DANIEL BAUM et al.

By: 
Christopher W. Quinn
Reg. No. 38,274

Date: 1-28-08

QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Suite 520
Novi, Michigan 48375
Phone: 248-380-9300
Fax: 248-380-8968